Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-107395

Case number	CAC-UDRP-107395
Time of filing	2025-03-11 09:27:12
Domain names	arcelorme.com

Case administrator

Organization	Iveta Špiclová (Czech Arbitration Court) (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	ARCELORMITTAL

Complainant representative

Organization	NAMESHIELD S.A.S.

Respondent

Name	Anil Kumar

OTHER LEGAL PROCEEDINGS

The Panel is not aware of any other legal proceedings which are pending or decided and which relate to the disputed domain name.

IDENTIFICATION OF RIGHTS

The Complainant has proved ownership of the following trademark rights:

- The International Trademark Registration No. 778212 for the mark “ARCELOR”, registered on February 25, 2002 and duly renewed, covering various goods and services across multiple jurisdictions.

The Complainant also owns a significant portfolio of domain names incorporating the distinctive element “ARCELOR”, including, inter alia:

- <arcelor.com>, registered and used since August 29, 2001.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

According to the information provided in the Complaint, the Complainant, ArcelorMittal, is the world’s leading steel and mining company, with a presence in over 60 countries. It specializes in the production of steel for various sectors including automotive, construction, household appliances and packaging. In 2023 alone, the Complainant produced 58.1 million tons of crude steel,

confirming its leadership in the global market. The Complainant also benefits from significant captive supplies of raw materials and manages extensive distribution networks worldwide. Further information is available on its official website at: www.arcelormittal.com.

The Complainant ARCELORMITTAL, through its extensive global operations and longstanding commercial presence, has acquired substantial goodwill in the ARCELOR name, which is widely recognized in the steel industry and beyond. The mark ARCELOR has been acknowledged as well-known in prior UDRP decisions. The Complainant further uses “Arcelor” as a company name and business identifier in the context of its corporate and commercial activities worldwide.

The disputed domain name <arcelorme.com> was registered on March 7, 2025. At the time of the filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a website displaying the Complainant’s official logo without authorization. Additionally, the domain name is configured with active MX (Mail Exchange) records, suggesting that it may be used for e-mail communication.

The Complainant submitted the following documents to substantiate the above facts:

- Annex 1: Information regarding the Complainant;
- Annex 2: Complainant’s trademarks;
- Annex 3: Complainant’s domain name;
- Annex 4: Whois of the disputed domain name;
- Annex 5: Website in relation with the disputed domain name;
- Annex 6: DNS configuration of the disputed domain name.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

The Complainant contends that the requirements of the Policy have been met and that the disputed domain name should be transferred to it.
No administratively compliant Response has been filed.

RIGHTS

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy).

NO RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the Respondent to have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy).

BAD FAITH

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy).

PROCEDURAL FACTORS

The Panel is satisfied that all procedural requirements under UDRP were met and there is no other reason why it would be inappropriate to provide a decision.

PRINCIPAL REASONS FOR THE DECISION

Identity (paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy)

The Panel finds that the disputed domain name <arcelorme.com> is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark ARCELOR.

Firstly, the Complainant's ARCELOR trademark is entirely incorporated in the disputed domain name, with the sole addition of the letters "me" at the end. This addition does not alter the overall impression of the domain name nor does it provide sufficient distinction from the Complainant's well-known mark. The trademark remains clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name.

Secondly, the added term "me" is insufficient to avoid the finding of confusing similarity. It is a short, non-distinctive suffix which does not dispel the impression that the domain name is connected to the Complainant. On the contrary, it reinforces the misleading potential of the disputed domain name, as Internet users may mistakenly perceive it as a localized or personalized version of the Complainant's brand.

Thus, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's ARCELOR trademark and does not contain any additional element that would negate or sufficiently differentiate it from the Complainant or its mark.

-

Absence of Rights or Legitimate Interests (paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy).

The Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name <arcelorme.com>.

Firstly, the Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant in any way. The Complainant has confirmed that it has not licensed, authorized, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use its trademark ARCELOR, or to register a domain name incorporating this trademark. There is no contractual or business relationship between the Complainant and the Respondent which would justify the use of the Complainant's mark.

Secondly, there is no indication that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name. The Whois information does not reflect any name or identity that could suggest a connection between the Respondent and the disputed domain name. In the absence of such evidence, the Panel concludes that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name within the meaning of the Policy.

Moreover, the Panel notes that the disputed domain name resolves to a website that displays the Complainant's logo. Such use is misleading, as it may deceive internet users into believing that the website is operated or endorsed by the Complainant. The purpose of this site appears to be the unauthorized imitation of the Complainant's official website, which could result in the collection of personal or confidential data from the Complainant's customers under false pretences. Such conduct is not consistent with a bona fide offering of goods or services and cannot be considered legitimate or fair use.

In CAC Case No. 106859, involving the domain name <xiaomi.moscow>, the Panel found that the respondent's use of the complainant's official logo and branding on a website offering purported products of the complainant constituted an attempt to mislead consumers and capitalize on the complainant's reputation. The Panel concluded that such use did not confer any rights or legitimate interests to the respondent.

Finally, the Respondent has failed to submit a response in these proceedings and has therefore not provided any explanation or evidence of rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. In the absence of such a response, and given the clear findings above, the Panel finds no basis to infer any rights or legitimate interests on the part of the Respondent.

Accordingly, the Panel concludes that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name <arcelorme.com>.

Bad faith (paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy):

The Panel finds that the disputed domain name <arcelorme.com> has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

Firstly, the Complainant has established that its ARCELOR trademark is widely known and enjoys a strong reputation in the steel industry. Given this notoriety, the Panel finds it unlikely that the Respondent could have registered the disputed domain name without knowledge of the Complainant and its trademark.

The notoriety of the ARCELOR trademark has been confirmed by previous panel decisions. In particular, in CAC Case No. 100756, ARCELORMITTAL S.A. v. Arcelor Staffing Solution, the panel held that "[t]the statement of the Respondent that he did not have any idea that ARCELOR is a registered trademark cannot be accepted given the fact that ARCELOR is a very well-known trademark." Similarly, in WIPO Case No. DME2018-0005, Arcelormittal (SA) v. floyd martins <arcelorsteel.me>, it was found that a simple internet search for "ARCELOR" would have revealed the Complainant and its trademark.

Secondly, the disputed domain name incorporates a minor modification of the Complainant's mark, namely the addition of the two letters "me" at the end, which is not sufficient to eliminate confusion. This is characteristic of typosquatting, a practice whereby a domain name is intentionally registered to mimic a well-known trademark with minor alterations to mislead internet users. The deliberate nature of this slight variation strongly suggests that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's mark and intentionally targeted it.

Furthermore, the disputed domain name resolves to a website displaying the Complainant's logo. The Panel finds that such reproduction of the Complainant's logo on the associated website is a deliberate attempt to impersonate the Complainant and deceive users into believing that the site is affiliated with or endorsed by the Complainant. This unauthorized use of the Complainant's branding is further evidence of bad faith.

In addition, the disputed domain name has been configured with MX (Mail Exchange) records, indicating that it may be used to send and receive e-mails. In CAC Case No. 102827, JCDECAUX SA v. Handi Hariyono, the panel found that the existence of active MX records in the absence of legitimate use suggested a potential for harmful misuse, particularly in the form of phishing. The same reasoning applies in the present case: the setup of MX records combined with the use of the Complainant's logo supports the inference that the domain name could be used to impersonate the Complainant and potentially collect personal information or mislead users.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its website. Such conduct, in the absence of any plausible legitimate explanation, constitutes bad faith registration and use under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

AND THE DISPUTED DOMAIN NAME(S) IS (ARE) TO BE

1. **arcelorme.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Nathalie Dreyfus**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2025-04-18